

## Eastern Illinois University The Keep

---

Minutes

Faculty Senate

---

1971

April 19, 1971

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins)

---

### Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "April 19, 1971" (1971). *Minutes*. 461.  
[https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen\\_mins/461](https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/461)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY SENATE  
Proceedings of April 19, 1971

MEMBERS PRESENT: Shuff, Katsimpalis, Trank, Funk, Lenihan, Whitlow, Nichols, Rawls, Barford, Downs, Elliott, Whalin, Foreman

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kluge, Owens

Student Observers Present: Marks, Birchler

Student Observers Absent: Grosboll

The meeting opened with a call by Mr. Tingley for nominations for Chairman. Mr. Downs nominated Mr. Whitlow. He was seconded by Mr. Lenihan. Mr. Trank moved that nominations be closed. He was seconded by Mr. Shuff. The motion passed with 11 ayes and 1 abstention. Mr. Whitlow was declared elected.

Mr. Tingley then made a short statement urging the Senate to make the most of its opportunities to establish a good working relationship with the new President.

Mr. Whitlow took over as chairman and called for nominations for Vice Chairman. Mr. Downs nominated Mr. Kluge. He was seconded by Mr. Funk. Mr. Barford nominated Mr. Lenihan. He was seconded by Mr. Whalin. Mr. Elliott moved that nominations be closed. He was seconded by Mr. Funk. Mr. Elliott called for a paper ballot. The results of the vote were 6 for Mr. Kluge, 6 for Mr. Lenihan. Mr. Whitlow then cast the deciding vote in favor of Mr. Lenihan.

Mr. Whitlow then called for nominations for Secretary. Mr. Kluge was nominated by Mr. Downs. He was seconded by Mr. Lenihan. Mr. Funk nominated Mr. Smith. Mr. Whitlow pointed out then in the event of Mr. Smith's election, we would require a temporary Secretary until the end of the quarter. There was a second for Mr. Smith's nomination. Mr. Lenihan moved that nominations be closed. He was seconded by Mr. Shuff. The motion passed with 10 ayes and 2 abstentions. Mr. Lenihan moved that Mr. Kluge be declared elected Secretary. He was seconded by Mr. Downs. The motion passed with 10 ayes, 2 abstentions.

REPORTS:

- A. Mr. Lenihan distributed the April 9, 1971 Proceedings of the Council of Instructional Officers. He had reported on the meeting last week.
- B. Mr. White came to the Senate to give the following monthly report from the Faculty Advisory Committee. He elaborated some on the contents of the report and answered questions. He was asked if anything had been said about the effect of budgetary stringencies and increases in faculty teaching loads in promoting the interest in professional negotiations. He said this was brought up but that Mr. Holderman indicated that was a concern of the faculties and was not something he could affect one way or the other, so little time was spent discussing it. Mr. Downs announced in connection with this that the annual meeting of the IAHE will be held on April 24, 1971 at Eastern. It will be a drive-in conference featuring professional negotiations. Faculty members desiring to attend should contact Dr. Grado by Friday, April 23. Mr. Barford also announced that the Annual meeting of the AAUP which he had just attended had discussed the deteriorating position of the faculty. The consensus at the AAUP meeting was that not only the economic condition of the faculty, but other matters such as its inadequate role in University governance and the position of non-tenured faculty members require faculties to take up professional negotiations.

TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: R. White, English  
SUBJECT: Monthly report from Faculty Advisory Committee

April 16, 1971

The Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (BHE) met on April 8, 1971 at Sangamon State University.

The entire morning session was devoted to a freely ranging discussion between James Holderman and Robert Carter of the BHE on the one hand, and members of the FAC on the other. (The FAC is comprised of one faculty representative from each State college and university, and selected representatives from junior colleges and private institutions of the state.)

The chief topic of discussion was the budget crisis, seen by Mr. Holderman as simply the focus for a period of low public esteem for higher education, in Illinois and across the land. For a whole range of reasons--from general unhappiness at high taxes and the high cost of living, to the high actual cost of higher education, to various conspicuous instances of apparent university mishandling of funds (mansions, airplanes, festivals), to some criticism of faculties who do not teach enough, to complaints about disruptive and disagreeable college students--higher education is unpopular, and thus offers a logical opportunity for the political structure to reduce costs without antagonizing (and perhaps even pleasing) the voting and tax-paying public. The situation exists from California to New York, and higher education must expect to get along with less for the near future: After being a growth industry since WWII, higher education is in for a recession. Not only faculty but administrators seem to Mr. Holderman naive as to the extent of current negative public feeling toward higher education: Mr. Holderman offered little hope that the legislature will restore the \$188 million budget cuts for higher education requested by Governor Ogilvie for fiscal 1972.

For documentation Mr. Holderman referred, among others, to three facts: (1) His recent appearance before the House Appropriations Committee was a grilling ordeal, with virtually no sympathetic voice to break the stream of criticism for what the Governor has called the "nearly insatiable" appetite of higher education; (2) The House Education Committee, despite a number of members ordinarily sympathetic to higher education, has approved by 14 to 2 the Bradley bill, which would require all full-time faculty members of State colleges and universities to meet a minimum of ten contact hours per week; (3) The House leadership has apparently employed a consulting firm to examine BHE practices in budget evaluation, cost cutting, and both new and old program evaluation.

The general conclusion was that all areas of higher education must not only stand together on minimal financial needs, but must make conspicuously evident to the legislature and to the general public their willingness to economize where possible and to increase costs only where public benefit is unmistakable.

On the matter of Master Plan phase III, Mr. Holderman reported that the document is in process of revision after the extensive public hearings, that its main thrust is likely to remain unchanged, that modifications are being made in several places, that ambiguous portions will be defined more clearly, that some additional rationale will be inserted, that the final draft should be ready for mailing on April 23, 1971, and that the BHE will devote a two-day meeting to that draft on May 4-5, conceivably reaching a final decision at that meeting.

The MP III concept of "University Centers" was discussed with some fervor and with no enthusiasm from FAC members, who seemed unimpressed by Mr. Holderman's suggestion that without some such concept no state institutions except U of I-Urbana and SIU-Carbondale would be likely to develop strong graduate programs. There was apparent FAC consensus that draft MP III by its ambiguities and undetailed proposals presents inherent dangers of statism and bureaucracy, also that the draft is dangerously vague

in urging undelineated concepts of social relevance, also that the draft seems more quantitative than qualitative in its general approach. The FAC passed without opposition a long and vaguely phrased resolution warning of dangers of draft MP III's proposal for a "collegiate common market": The danger was seen to be in arousing excessive public and legislative expectations as to the economic and educational benefits to be derived from prescribed cooperative educational enterprises, since over-zealous cooperation might well prove to be false economy.

The next meeting of the FAC, on May 7 in Chicago, will possibly occur after BHE approval of MP III, but probably well before the 1972 budget for higher education is anywhere near completion.

\* \* \* \* \*

- C. Mr. Elliott reported that the Council on University Planning met last Wednesday and will meet again this Wednesday. He distributed the minutes of last week's meeting.
- D. Mr. Whitlow reported for the Nominations Committee that Tom Nickels, Robert Saltmarsh, and Herb Lasky who were appointed last week by the Senate as members of the Who's Who Committee have all agreed to serve. Mr. Whitlow also submitted the following two reports of the Elections Committee on behalf of Mr. Kluge.

The following are the results of the elections held Tuesday, April 13, 1971:

FACULTY SENATE

187 Trank, Lynn  
176 Shuff, Robert  
164 Foreman, Paul  
163 Katsimpalis, Tom  
149 Owens, Wayne  
149 Maurer, Dave  
141 Doughty, Earl  
134 Rearden, John  
131 Brooks, Herb  
122 Keiter, Richard

COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

189 Connelly, Joe  
159 Radtke, Anola  
158 Shuff, Marian S.  
152 Woodall, Tom  
139 Stoner, Sue  
110 Rooke, Jerry

GRADUATE COUNCIL Letters & Science

193 Krehbiel, Eugene E.  
110 Kelleher, John

GRADUATE COUNCIL Other Than L & S

Tie between Owens & Maurer to be Resolved.

157 Overton, Paul  
141 MacLaren, Fred

Consequently, the following is the membership of the Faculty Senate for the coming year: (Name in parentheses indicates present substitute)

Term to Expire  
Spring, 1972

Barford, Robert  
Hattabaugh, Fred (Funk)  
Kluge, Don  
Read, Mary Jo (Rawls)  
Whitlow, Roger

Term to Expire  
Spring, 1973

Downs, Dale  
Elliott, Tom  
Lenihan, Pat  
Smith, Calvin (Nichols)  
Whalin, Ed

Term to Expire  
Spring, 1974

Foreman, Paul  
Katsimpalis, Tom  
Maurer, David OR  
Owens, Wayne  
Shuff, Bob  
Trank, Lynn

\* \* \* \* \*

TO: Faculty Senate  
FROM: Donald A. Kluge

DATE: April 16, 1971

The tie between Wayne Owens and Dave Maurer was broken by a flip of the coin on Thursday morning in Dr. Maurer's office with Tingley, Whitlow, Kluge, Maurer, and Owens present. As Owens won the flip of the coin, he will be the fifth member of the Faculty Senate with his term to expire in the Spring of 1974. It is my sincere hope that this is the last report of the present Chairman of the Faculty Senate Elections Committee.

\* \* \* \* \*

- E. Mr. Whalin reported that three replies had been received so far in response to a request for comments on the Proposal for a Statement on the Professional Duties of Faculty. All the replies were favorable. Mr. Nichols reported that the History Department had held a meeting and except for one abstention had voted unanimously in favor of the statement.
- F. Mr. Whalin and Mr. Marks reported on the meeting last Thursday of the President's Advisory Council. The President discussed the budget situation. The teacher evaluation project was reviewed. The means of paying for last years project was discussed. The students are paying for the materials used, about \$450, and about the same amount for computer use will be paid by the administration. It was thought that the project was worth continuing for another year with one evaluation in the fall quarter. The students will finance half of it and the Faculty Senate the other half. Two matters requiring action by the Faculty Senate were brought up. The National Collegiate Athletic Association has adopted a regulation requiring that boards having control of athletic policy must have a majority of faculty voting members. Our present board has a 4 to 3 student-faculty representation. The Faculty Senate was requested to add another faculty member and the Student Senate was asked to reduce the student representation to 3 upon the next expiration of a student member's term.

The Student Senate wants to change the composition of the Apportionment Board from a 4-3 student-faculty membership ratio to 7 student voting members and some faculty ex-officio members. This requires action by both the Student Senate and the Faculty Senate. Mr. Marks distributed the following proposal:

Motion to Amend the APPENDIX A, Organization of Student-Faculty Apportionment Board, By-Laws and Operating Procedures Student-Faculty Apportionment Board: to the following:

- I. The Apportionment Board shall consist of a total membership of eleven, composed of seven voting student members and four ex-officio, non-voting members.
  - A. The Faculty Senate shall appoint one ex-officio faculty member to the Apportionment Board, to serve a one year term with possible additional one year reappointment.
  - B. The Student Senate shall appoint student members to the Board, with the Financial Vice President of the Student Body serving as chairman.
  - C. The term of office for voting members shall be two years.
  - D. The following shall serve as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Board:
    - 1. Faculty Representative
    - 2. Executive Vice President of the Student Body
    - 3. Associate Dean of Student Activities
    - 4. Internal Auditor
  - E. Alternates
    - 1. If the faculty member is to be on leave of absence for an extended period of time, the Faculty Senate shall appoint an alternate for either a temporary or a permanent appointment.

2. In the event a student is to be absent for an extended period of time, the chairman shall ask the President of the Student Body to appoint an alternate for a temporary or permanent appointment.

II. Quorum. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting membership of the Board.

III. Presiding Officer. The chairman shall call meetings and preside.

\* \* \* \* \*

- G. Mr. Connelly gave a report on a meeting last week of the Legislative Conference. All state institutions were represented except Northeastern. Various matters of concern to higher education were discussed including next year's budget, the funding of the state retirement system, and bills affecting higher education which have been introduced in the General Assembly. It was decided to concentrate at this time on the budget as the most critical matter. He pointed out that this year's budget as presented by the Board of Higher Education was an austerity budget. The majority of the increases in the Higher Board's proposal budget were for funding junior colleges, scholarships, health services and aid to private institutions. These were items for which the Governor had indicated a high priority. The Senior Institutions are at the lowest priority. Last year State Employees except for those in higher education got automatic increases due to their salary scales which averaged about 6% and got another 6% cost of living increase. Faculty members in state schools received average increases of about 4½%. If the Governor's proposed cut of \$188,000,000 in the higher education budget is adopted, the chances for salary raises for faculty members appears very poor, but it has been proposed to give other state employees in addition to their automatic increases of about 6%, a 3% cost of living raise plus fringe benefits worth about another 4%. While the members of the Legislative Conference did not feel that the proposed budget of the Board of Higher Education was entirely satisfactory, it seems apparent at this time that there is no realistic chance that the legislature will increase it. Therefore, the conference is seeking approval of the various Faculty Senates to seek adoption of the proposed Board of Higher Education Budget. Mr. Barford moved that Mr. Connelly be authorized by the Faculty Senate to work for the adoption of the budget of the Board of Higher Education. He was seconded by Mr. Downs. The motion passed with 8 ayes, 1 nay, and 3 abstentions.
- H. Mr. Elliott reported that he had asked for comments on the reports of the Committee on Tenure and Dismissal and had received one so far and said he would like to wait another week before bringing in a revised report.
- I. Mr. Lenihan requested comments from the faculty on the following draft of the report from the Committee on Master Plan III.

#### REPORT ON MASTER PLAN PHASE III

Few people after a careful reading of Master Plan Phase III would state that it is all bad. However, an institutional spokesman limited to five minutes would probably discuss the negative elements of MP III as they affect his institution. Since we are not limited by time in this statement, we would like to comment on some of the favorable elements of the plan.

1. The general thrust of the document can be applauded. We can all support the attempt to make more effective use of our scarce educational resources.
2. Along this same line the proposal of an educational common market is intriguing. There is the possibility that all partners in the common market could benefit.

The specific list of suggestions (p. 21) could begin on a two or three institutions basis without waiting for the proposed regional councils. Such a program could be beneficial to students, faculty, and administration. The student would have a larger choice of courses, the faculty could benefit from the interaction with their colleagues at other institutions. The administration might find some of the financial pressures eased from interinstitutional cooperation.

3. We can all support the call of the Carnegie Commission to provide more options for students and to encourage more older persons to continue their education. Each institution and cooperating groups of institutions could address itself to these objectives immediately.
4. One response to MP III which will be painful for the institutions affected but will benefit them will be the critical internal evaluations of on-going programs. MP III should encourage the institutions to set up criteria for judging the worth of programs. If the stringent enrollment limitations become a fact, the least successful programs will have to be phased out. This need to phase out some programs will raise basic questions about objectives and needs for all programs.
5. Chapter six of MP III expresses the hope of all members of the academic community that relations with the communities in which they live can be improved. Improved and expanded extension programs seem an ideal way to accomplish this objective.

Obviously a comprehensive statement with the far-reaching effects of MP III will not please everyone, but there are shortcomings to the plan which we would like to point out.

1. The designation of six graduate centers is hard on the morale of the faculties of the non-elect schools. Given the status attached to graduate education in the U.S. today, to teach at a non-graduate center is to be given permanent second class citizenship. This may effect recruitment at the non-centers (although if the oversupply of Ph.D. figures are correct, recruitment may become easier in all of higher education.) Could the same result be accomplished by requirement of substantial evidence of need for any new graduate program approved by the board?
2. The overall effect of MP III is to freeze the universities' structure and nature. If the graduate enrollment ceilings are imposed on top of the present freshman-sophomore ceilings, the junior-senior group is frozen also. The arguments in favor of providing individuals with greater choice in their programs would seem to apply to institutions as well.
3. There seems to be a contradiction in MP III between the call for the universities to enroll larger numbers of economically and educationally disadvantaged students and the strict enrollment ceiling in each sub group of students within the schools. The more successful a school is in attracting black, poor, and older students to continue their education, the more restrictive the enrollment ceilings will seem.
4. The figures on the projected oversupply of Ph.D.'s are chilling to a faculty member, and they should signal a showdown in the growth of new Ph.D. programs. However, these same figures also raise the question of the necessity of new Doctor of Arts programs. Perhaps the D.A. could become a step on the way to the Ph.D. For instance, it could be awarded when all requirements except the thesis are completed. It would then replace the present ABD (all but dissertation) designation. But it would constitute a terminal degree if the individual so chose.

Planning is extremely important to any segment of our society and we congratulate the Board of Higher Education in its attempt to coordinate and integrate the educational advantages provided by the State of Illinois; however, planning should be for the future

and not adopted on a retroactive basis. Planning is the only way to fiscal responsibility as well as to enhance the many aspects of higher education which in turn are designed to meet the needs of our society. It would seem Phase III tends to plan without taking into consideration the needs of our society, especially within the boundaries of our State, nor does it specify objectives with proper rationale. Planning of this nature tends to cast a negative image on the campus and in turn has a tendency to undermine morale of the members of the academic community, faculty, staff, students and administrators. Consequently, "retroactive planning" lends itself to indecision within the University and gives the impression of "why work to build it up, the Board of Higher Education will take it away from us in a few years."

The justification for phasing out the specialist degree is the reduction of numbers of degrees offered in the state. Rather than make a decision at the top to kill an existing program why not permit the market to decide the usefulness of a specialist. If students find that a specialist degree serves their needs and enhances their occupational opportunities, they will enroll in the program, and the "critical mass" (p. 33) will be achieved.

The dip in expected enrollments from 1982 to 1988 presents a serious planning problem. But the solution proposed in MP III should not be accepted. The enrollment figures of Table I (p. 56) will not be achieved if space in the public universities is not available. If permanent facilities to accommodate only the 1976 enrollments are built, the enrollment projections for 1977-1988 will not be achieved; and the percentage of the population enrolled in college (on campus enrollment rate) will drop in Illinois contrary to the national trend. Hopefully some sort of compromise between under capacity and over capacity can be worked out with the shortage of space overcome by temporary facilities. This would involve raising the enrollment ceilings of all public institutions or opening more schools.

The arguments for keeping the lab school have been presented already by spokesmen for Eastern and Charleston. An evaluation of the reasons for closing the lab school cannot be made until those reasons are presented.

We recommend that the establishment of regional centers to accomplish institutional cooperation be carefully evaluated. It may show that the extra cost savings of a permanent staff for the regional centers will not justify the cost savings of cooperation.

The Faculty Senate endorses the position of the various persons who have written letters and who spoke at the hearing in opposition to phasing out the Buzzard Laboratory School, the limitation on graduate enrollment, and phasing out of the Specialists degree program in Educational Administration and the ceilings placed on undergraduate enrollments.

Eastern, in the past, has had planned growth in terms of enrollment, additions to the curriculum, physical expansion and has executed fiscal responsibility. The result seems to be a responsible student body and an accountable faculty. Planning at Eastern has been in keeping with the first two phases of the Master Plan with diversity, flexibility and adaptability, plus meeting the needs of our geographical area of the State of Illinois. This plan developed by the academic community has soundness and should be continued within the overall guidelines of Phase III of the Master Plan, but should not be governed nor reduced because of those guidelines. We respectfully submit that Phase III be modified to include the Eastern Plan within the general guidelines of the Master Plan.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### COMMUNICATIONS:

- A. The following memorandum from President Doudna with Mr. Tingley's reply:



TO: Dr. Tingley

DATE: April 15, 1971

Your memorandum with respect to the creation of the position University Legal Counsel seems subject to the interpretation that the reason you believe the position should not be established relates principally, if not entirely, to the budgetary situation. Please advise if this is a correct interpretation.

Quincy Doudna  
President

TO: President Doudna  
FROM: Chairman, Faculty Senate

DATE: April 16, 1971

Your interpretation of the attitude of the Faculty Senate toward the creation of a new post of University legal Counsel is incorrect. At the outset a more comprehensive motion was offered but as passed was restricted to the budgetary concept because this seemed to suffice at this time.

Other concerns were:

1. It would be unwise to create a new position at this time when there is to be a change in administration on September 1.
2. There is considerable doubt as to whether the post can be justified in terms of the amount of legal work to be done.
3. In any event if the post is created, the new president should be the man to choose the legal counsel.

I might add that rumors continue to persist that someone had already been chosen for the job. Perhaps your memo of April 9, 1971 to Dr. Whalin will correct this impression.

Donald Tingley

B. The following memorandum from Mrs. Swope:

TO: Faculty Senate  
DATE: April 13, 1971  
SUBJECT: Report of Bylaws Committee

I would like to raise an objection to the report of the Bylaws Committee as reported in the Proceedings of March 29, 1971 in regard to No. IV Library Committee.

It has been recommended that the Faculty Library Advisory Committee shall have ten members, five of which shall represent the College of Letters and Science, one representing the School of Music, one the School of Business, one the Faculty for Professional Education and the School of Elementary Education and Junior High School Teaching, and one for the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, School of Home Economics, and School of Industrial Arts and Technology.

It is ridiculous to think that one member can represent the needs of three schools. It is obvious from past performance of the Library Committee that allocations are made on the basis of representation. The School of Home Economics has actually never had a Library Committee representative and as a result, our budget has been at the \$5,000-\$6,000 level when a single department in the College of Letters and Science might have a budget 300% larger in a department in which the number of majors is not equal to the majors in the School of Home Economics.

I would highly recommend that each School be given at least one representative on the Library Committee in order that their needs may be adequately presented.

Thank you for your consideration of this recommendation.

C. The following memorandum from Mr. Gover:

TO: Faculty Senate  
SUBJECT: Distinguished Faculty Award

April 14, 1971

As I recall, the Faculty Senate has not received information regarding the continuation of the Distinguished Faculty Award which has been made here for the past three years.

It is likely that funds were not provided to continue the honorarium. However, I would urge the Faculty Senate to continue the award even if it is not possible to provide an honorarium.

There are many excellent faculty members on our staff and it is desirable that we continue to recognize and promote excellent teaching. I would like to see the Faculty Senate continue to select the Distinguished Faculty member as in the past.

D. The following memorandum from Mr. Martin:

TO: Faculty Senate  
SUBJECT: Mr. Funk's Motion with respect to Disenfranchisement of Executive Assistants

DATE: April 16, 1971

The proceedings of the Faculty Senate for April 12, 1971, carry a motion by Mr. Funk to the effect that an amendment to the Faculty Senate Constitution be drafted to exclude these individuals classified as Executive Assistants from the definition of faculty. It is difficult to believe that any one would deliberately move to disenfranchise 80 plus members of the faculty at Eastern Illinois University for such a simple reason as making two definitions match. It would appear that Mr. Funk is aiming toward division of faculty rather than working toward consolidation of faculty.

I respectfully request that the members of the Senate vote to remove such a motion from any consideration.

E. The following communication:

The Finance Subcommittee of the Student Advisory Committee of the Illinois Board of Higher Education, after careful analysis of the impact of the proposed tuition increase on the ability of college-able youth to afford a college education, would like to respectfully make the following comments and recommendations:

When the staff of the Board of Higher Education recommended tuition increases and phase-outs of certain student aid programs, great concern was expressed by those who feared the consequences from such actions on the ability of college-able youth to afford a college education. This concern existed, although the Board of Higher Education specified that additional funds would be made available to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission (ISSC) to offset these charges for college-able youth with financial need. Many of us feel that the study of which these recommendations were made was most hasty.

Perhaps we are unnecessarily concerned, but it appears to us that the recommended additional ISSC appropriations may be inadequate. In any event, we think that the Board of Higher Education should be prepared to back up its estimate--on which thousands from

middle and lower income Illinois families depend--with a guarantee that no student who is found by the ISSC to be eligible for aid will be denied any fraction of the full grant to which present ISSC rules entitle him.

If the Board's staff has estimated ISSC needs accurately, then at least college access for those who apply for ISSC awards may not be worsened. If, as we fear, it has not, the board should divert back to the ISSC a greater portion of the proceeds of its tuition increases and award discontinuances.

Even if such steps were taken by the Board of Higher Education, needy graduate students who do not currently receive tuition waivers would have to absorb the total impact of a tuition increase, since graduate students are not eligible for ISSC awards.

Therefore we request that:

1. An increase in tuition be held off until a thorough study of state financial-aid policies and procedures is completed to guarantee that all college-able youth will have no financial aid barriers.
11. If a tuition increase is a budgetary necessity, we request that such an increase not be approved without first seeking from the Board of Higher Education the guarantee that the ISSC program will be adequately funded; that is, that first claim on the proceeds of these tuition increases and award discontinuances will be ISSC needs and that only after these are fully met will this new revenue go to any other purpose.

The Board of Higher Education, by its own statements, is already committed to such a position in principle. This guarantee will simply define that commitment in practice.

But our concern does not end with a guarantee that present financial barriers not be made higher.

The staff of the Board of Higher Education has been hasty in recommending higher charges to those students who they say can afford them. This has not been matched by a similar haste to bring relief to those who cannot afford the present costs of public higher education in Illinois, even when assisted by present financial aid programs.

111. Based on the following facts:

- A. All in-state undergraduates in Illinois public higher education receive considerable state assistance with their instructional costs through below-cost tuition. Half receive further assistance; for example, grants were made last year to 90% of all applicants to the ISSC whose family incomes were less than \$9000 and to 50% of those whose families had between \$9,000 and \$15,000.
- B. But at this time NO state aid is extended BEYOND TUITION AND FEES, although these are a relatively small part of the public college student's total expense. For those who cannot earn, borrow, and receive from parents sufficient funds to cover non-tuition costs (room, board, books, supplies, travel to college, etc.), low tuition --even zero tuition--may simply not be enough. Nor have federal and private aid programs been adequate to make up the difference.
- C. At the same time, under present ISSC award rules a moderately affluent student who chooses a private Illinois college and demonstrates that he is short (say) \$1000 of meeting its relatively high charges can receive that entire \$1000 from the ISSC. It is less than his tuition and fees and less than the present ISSC award ceiling (\$1200). But a much less affluent student who needs an equal amount--\$1000--just to attend a much less expensive state school, like ours, cannot be awarded as much as half that amount because ISSC is restricted, by law, to tuition and fees.

If it is worth millions to the people of Illinois to keep public tuitions low for all (even when, as at Urbana, at least one student in five comes from a family enjoying an income greater than \$20,000 a year), and if it is worth additional millions to give middle and upper income students the economic freedom to choose private colleges (more than 3/4 of the ISSC budget last year went to that purpose), then surely it is worth it to Illinois to spend modest additional sums to enable those with greater need at least some choice among public colleges. This year fewer than one Urbana freshman in five is from the lower income half of Illinois.

We therefore recommend that the Board of Higher Education be requested to give serious consideration to lifting the present restriction of ISSC awards to the value of tuition and fees. We believe that ISSC should have the flexibility to extend awards beyond that limit as other aid programs change, as students' abilities to meet changing college costs change with changed economic circumstances, and as its own budget may allow. It is important to give the ISSC this flexibility this spring for it to be able now to plan ways to refine its programs.

Robert Winter, Chairman  
Finance Subcommittee of the Student Advisory Committee  
to the Illinois Board of Higher Education

OLD BUSINESS:

- A. The matter of Mr. Funk's motion on proposed amendments to the Faculty Senate constitution was brought up. Mr. Whitlow said that Mr. Owens was not able to attend today and had requested that the matter of Mr. Funk's motion not be taken up until next week when he could be present. Mr. Lenihan moved to place Mr. Funk's motion on the agenda. He was seconded by Mr. Rawls. The motion passed with 10 ayes, 1 nay, 1 abstention.

NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Barford requested that a questionnaire be attached to the end of the proceedings concerning visitation policy. By consensus this was agreed to.

The meeting adjourned at 1:47 p.m. The next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on Monday, April 26, 1971 at 12:00 noon in the Heritage Room of the University Union.

AGENDA:

1. Master Plan III letter.
2. Apportionment Board
3. Mr. Gover's Distinguished Professor memorandum.

Edwin Whalin  
Secretary

FACULTY VISITATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please return this questionnaire to Dr. Robert Barford, Coleman Hall 316J, by Thursday, April 30th.

Note: The stated objectives of the visitation policy are: 1) to improve teaching i.e. criticism; and 2) to give non-tenured faculty "some idea of their performance as teachers" i.e. evaluation in terms of progress toward tenure, cf, the directive of Vice President Moody dated September 29, 1969.

A. To be answered by non-tenured faculty:

1. How many times have you been visited since September 1969 0 1 2 3 4 (circle).
2. Were you given ample notice of the date of visitation Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_.
3. Were the objectives of the policy, as stated above, explained to you before the visitation Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_.
4. Did you receive immediately after the visitation a short constructive critique of your performance Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_.
5. Did you have confidence in the judgment of the person who visited you Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_.
6. Do you believe that the visitation helped you to improve your instruction Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_.
7. Do you believe that visitation is an accurate way of evaluating your teaching performance Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_.
8. Do you believe that the visitation program ought to be continued Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_.
9. If you answered "No" to either 6 or 7, then discuss briefly 1) how you think your teaching can be effectively criticized and 2) how non-tenured faculty can be evaluated as regard their teaching performance: (use reverse side, if necessary)

B. To be answered by Department Heads:

1. Do you think that the visitation program ought to be continued Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_.
2. If you answered "Yes" to 1, then state briefly how you think the program can be improved, and if you answered "No", then state briefly how you think teaching can be improved and the teaching performance of non-tenured faculty effectively evaluated. (answer on the reverse side)

C. Comments of tenured faculty on the program are welcome.